

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 303 465

SF 030 921

AUTHOR Brown, John L.; Greenberg, James D.
TITLE The University High School: An Early Intervention
Collaboration "From Scratch".
PUB DATE Mar 89
NOTE 32p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the
American Association of Colleges for Teacher
Education (Anaheim, CA, March 2-5, 1989).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports -
Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Articulation (Education); College Bound Students;
*College Preparation; *College School Cooperation;
High Schools; *High School Students; *Magnet Schools;
*Minority Groups; Program Development; *Student
Recruitment
IDENTIFIERS Prince Georges County Public Schools (MD); University
of Maryland

ABSTRACT

This paper presents a special case of collaboration involving the University of Maryland and the Prince George's County public schools. This program has created a magnet school with a college preparatory curriculum and an instructional program designed to meet the needs of college-bound minority high school students of all ability levels and backgrounds. The background and guiding perspectives on collaboration which motivated the efforts described in this case are delineated. A summary is given of the formal collaboration history of the current program. The first stage of collaborative field research interviews concerning suggestions and models for an effective college preparatory high school program are summarized, and an overview of the second stage of the collaboration is presented. Discussions are also offered on the activities, projects, and resources associated with the first year implementation of the University High School. Findings and conclusions concerning school system and university collaborative projects are presented. (JD)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED303465

THE UNIVERSITY HIGH SCHOOL:
AN EARLY INTERVENTION COLLABORATION "FROM SCRATCH"

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. D. Greenberg

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

John L. Brown
Supervisor of Program Development
Prince George's County Schools
Upper Marlboro, Maryland

James D. Greenberg
Director, Office of
Lab Experiences-Outreach
College of Education
University of Maryland
College Park, Maryland

AACTE
Annual Meeting
Anaheim, California
March 2-5, 1989

SP030921

THE UNIVERSITY HIGH SCHOOL:

AN EARLY INTERVENTION COLLABORATION "FROM SCRATCH"

Abstract

As American public education moves to address the extraordinary needs of a pluralistic, multicultural nation, it faces the very critical priority of improving minority admission and retention conditions at the college and university level. According to the American Council on Education, we are facing a "national crisis" in declining minority enrollment and that is evident throughout the United States today. Although minorities by the year 2000 are projected to comprise one-third of the American population, current higher education enrollment figures show only 17 percent of the college population to be minority.

Prince George's County Public Schools, and the University of Maryland, College Park, are currently engaged in a unique and ongoing collaborative effort to improve the minority experience at the post-secondary level. The changing demographics of Prince George's County, and its creative efforts to support positive desegregation approaches, make this an ideal place to attempt significant experiments in this domain. Thus, supported by the Maryland State Board for Higher Education, these institutions have been mutually engaged in the creation of a state-of-the-art college preparatory curriculum and instructional program designed to meet the needs of college-bound students of all ability levels and backgrounds.

The University High School, one of the Prince George's County Public Schools magnet programs and located at Suitland High School in Forestville, Maryland, is designed as a model 9-12 college preparatory experience. At the heart of the program is a stated commitment to ensuring that all program participants are supported in developing those academic competencies identified by the College Board as necessary for success at the college or university level. This Early Intervention focus specifically targets first-generation college-bound students; through the interaction of faculties at both institutions, a special curriculum modeled on Mortimer Adler's Paideia Proposal has been created. Combining didactic, coaching, and seminar instruction, this program targets students' development of analytical reading, speaking/listening, writing, math problem solving, critical thinking, and advanced study skills.

The background for this innovative and ambitious effort is important. From the beginning, the University High School was conceived of as a collaborative endeavor, and officials at the highest level made that collaboration a public and central feature of the program even prior to the initial specific planning meetings. That joint commitment was supported by a long history of successful and mutually productive collaboration -- especially in the area of preservice and inservice teacher education. Building on this strong base, the planning task force was launched with a visible representation from higher education as well as from a number of secondary schools in the County.

University representation was present throughout the initial planning stages, and this led to one of the novel strategies that provided both valuable data as well as a model for collaborative program

development. The strategy involved a "research" and data collection effort designed as a basic needs assessment. A team of secondary teachers, who had been involved in the large planning task force, joined with the University representative to comprise an interviewing team. This team, which developed a semi-structured interview instrument, interviewed a cross-section of University faculty who worked primarily with freshmen and sophomores. The questions, and the ensuing discussions, focussed on the underlying issue, i.e. if you could recommend to a secondary school particular emphases and activities to improve the potential success of the students you meet when they come to college, what would they be? Parallel interviews were held with University students who were graduates of Prince George's County High Schools. The results were fascinating, and somewhat surprising. They helped form the basis of program planning for the University High School.

Another particularly interesting aspect of the project has been the involvement of University of Maryland faculty members in a series of *Curriculum Dialogues* prior to the design of the curriculum itself. Over 56 instructors participated in these seven sessions, conducted during the 1986-87 academic year. In two-hour sessions, participants were asked to discuss and evaluate models for Early Intervention programs; instructors examined a variety of issues, including guidance and counseling strategies, critical thinking models, and issues centering on the following disciplines: Communication Skills; English; Behavioral and Social Sciences; the Humanities; Math and Computer Science; and the Natural Sciences. Again, the results provided critical input for the curriculum that was developed.

Additionally, University of Maryland personnel have been actively involved in University High School staff development activities. From sessions on writing across the disciplines and critical thinking to suggestions for research and evaluation projects, university personnel have interacted on a regular basis. University of Maryland faculty have also visited the school regularly to do guest presentations on a variety of special topics in all major academic subjects.

This project reinforces the critical need for institutions to break down bureaucratic barriers to allow active communication to occur. Participants have been very pleased with the opportunities for cross-program communication and for university personnel to take a direct hand in the construction of an effective Early Intervention effort. Of particular significance, also, is the broadening of the University participation to include many arts and sciences faculty along side College of Education faculty.

The presentation will elaborate the unique collaborative planning strategies utilized as well as the results of the first year's experience with the model school program. University and school personnel will jointly present in this session, and time for questions and discussion will be planned for and assured.

Preface

This paper attempts to present a picture of a special case of collaboration involving the University of Maryland, College Park and the Prince George's County Public Schools. It seeks to present both the unique features of the particular case while attending to the context factors and relevant generalizations that emerged from and guided this process. The paper is organized according to the following sections:

I. Delineation of background and guiding perspectives on collaboration which motivated the efforts described in this case

II. Summary of the formal collaboration history between the University of Maryland and the Prince George's County Public Schools, including the history of the present case

III. Summary of the first stage of collaborative field research, interviews by County teachers of University faculty and students concerning suggestions and models for an effective college preparatory high school program

IV. Overview of the second stage of collaborative field research, the series of Curriculum Dialogues associated with development of specific program plans for the University High School

V. The Northwestern Collaborative Project -- an extension of the partnership

VI. Summary of the activities, projects, and resources associated with the first year implementation of the University High School

VII. Findings and conclusions concerning school system and university collaborative projects

THE UNIVERSITY HIGH SCHOOL:

AN EARLY INTERVENTION COLLABORATION "FROM SCRATCH"

Background

In the face of the massive restructuring efforts currently underway in public school systems throughout the country, it becomes increasingly imperative for those systems to access the phenomenal resources and expertise offered by local colleges and universities. Through the process of open and ongoing collaboration with these institutions, public schools are able to greatly enhance their efforts to transcend the limitations of the Industrial Age/factory paradigm and instructional delivery system which have dominated 20th Century public education and generated the numerous revisionist reports currently calling for a major reinvention of public schools as institutions. In essence, formal collaborations with the community at large, including both the business and academic worlds, allow local school systems to institutionalize access to the human and technical resources available in those arenas in order to improve the quality of services they provide their student populations. In turn, colleges and universities are finding more and more that improved recruitment, articulation and educational program development can benefit from these same closer connections and working relationships with the schools.

History of Collaboration

Any collaborative venture in education must relate to the history of collaboration between or among the institutions involved. Either there is a positive history to build on, a negative history to overcome, a combination, or a relatively "clean slate" which implies a fresh (perhaps *innocent*) start for the participants. In any case, the historical context is important and should be kept in mind by individuals who begin new collaborative projects.

The history of collaboration between the University of Maryland and the Prince George's County Schools is extensive. Both these institutions are quite large, and they operate within the frameworks of inevitable bureaucratic organizations; however, their interest in and experience with collaboration date back 40 years and the range of collaborative activity has spanned an entire continuum -- from simple "consumer - seller" relationships to true collaborative partnerships. (For a full treatment of this history, and the "Stages of Collaboration" model, see: Erly, Maurice and Greenberg, James, "Interinstitutional Collaboration: A Descriptive Model for Improving Teacher Education", paper presented at the International Seminar for Teacher Education in the 80's and 90's, University of Groningen, The Netherlands, April, 1982.)

Highlights of the rich collaboration history of these two institutions include two Teacher Education Centers, a comprehensive curriculum development, community involvement, and preservice/in-service program known as "Project Cooperation", a series of elementary and

secondary Professional Development Centers, a systemwide needs assessment and staff development master plan initiative, and a Collaborative Task Force which met monthly for approximately ten years. It should be noted that these collaborative forums and projects, and the many others not directly cited, included significant mutual budget sharing, joint personnel appointments, collaborative planning and decision making, joint research, and extensive communications vehicles. (However, the University's participation was almost completely through the College of Education.) On the whole, appreciation of the value, productivity, and potential of collaboration had been reinforced through the vast experience suggested previously; and a number of officials in both institutions had a personal understanding and direct experience that would be supportive of further collaborative endeavors. While the practical complexities inherent in such ventures could be anticipated by these individuals, the processes required for success were also known and understood.

History of the University High School Case

In 1984, a new school superintendent was hired in Prince George's County. At the time, the University of Maryland - Prince George's Collaborative Task Force was meeting on a regular basis and the new superintendent was asked to come to the meeting and talk about his ideas regarding collaboration. Among the things he mentioned was an idea for a University High School, a magnet school which would emphasize preparation for college and heavily utilize University of Maryland people and resources in the operation.

During the ensuing months, a major initiative was undertaken involving the creation and development of a network of "magnet" schools, and a highly visible community monitoring committee was formed to comment on and inform the process. The committee was known as The Committee of One Hundred and the designated chair was the Chancellor of the University of Maryland, College Park. While the underlying motivation and pressure for this initiative was the school system's court ordered desegregation and the requirement by the court that the school system devise means to redress racial imbalances, curriculum and programmatic issues were also encompassed in the magnet school proposals. A multi-stage plan was developed, and after the first stage had been implemented and gained acceptance, the concept of a University High School was injected as part of a subsequent phase. While this planning was going on, the University High School remained a vague notion -- included with other "models" being considered in this comprehensive and large scale magnet school proposal (projected to involve over 40 schools within a five year phased-development period). Any interchange which may have occurred between school system officials and University officials at this point was restricted to simple mutual support at the most general concept level.

The next significant interaction involving the University High School occurred in early November, 1985, when the Superintendent invited the Chancellor, the Dean of the College of Education, and the Director of Laboratory Experiences and Outreach to come to a planning meeting. What this turned out to be was a "kickoff" event for a large committee of teachers and administrators formulated to help draft a design for the

University High School magnet. The intent was apparently to provide some motivation, perspective, and sense of top level support to the school system representatives who would be asked to do the thinking and planning regarding specific goals and models. A brief discussion outside the committee room, prior to the entrance of the University representatives, made it clear that the Superintendent and the Chancellor had very different ideas about what the University High School should be and where it would be located. Nevertheless, the University contingent presented a totally cooperative, and committed, public face. The appearance at the meeting conveyed a true commitment toward working together, sharing resources, and supporting the efforts to be undertaken. These sentiments were, indeed, genuine and consistent with both historical precedents and prevailing intent. It appeared that the two institutional leaders were comfortable that the "details could be worked out later".

Within one month of the "kickoff" meeting, a report of the school system's committee was presented to the Superintendent and then to the Board of Education. This report was sent to the Chancellor and subsequently passed on by his office to the College of Education representatives who had been involved in the initial meeting. The request to the College of Education was to work with the County on next steps. There were two reactions at the College of Education level. First, the expected and appropriate response was one of willingness to cooperate and to explore possible connections. Second, however, was the response of some puzzlement and incredulity regarding the process that

produced a fairly detailed document, even if draft form, that neither sought nor received any input from the University whatsoever.

A steering committee was convened by the school system leadership to plan for implementation of the University High School magnet. That committee included the chairs of the subcommittees that contributed to the draft report, and a University representative. At the initial meeting of this steering committee, it was clear that the process to define implementation steps would be collaborative and that most items in the initial report would be open for reconsideration. The University representative made clear the perception that the process would have been more consistent with the underlying concept if there had been involvement in all stages of conceptualizing and report writing. Nevertheless, while all acknowledged this perspective, the focus was a positive one of defining areas of concern and seeking consensus. Even the most basic matters were called into question, such as the goals of the school and the appropriate student population to be served. Brainstorming and consultation with experts helped clarify the alternatives and set direction.

In this context, and in relation to program design, the University representative suggested that the committee move beyond the usual process boundaries and expand the input through an organized data gathering process. He volunteered to put together a process whereby representative teachers from the original planning committees would come to campus and interview faculty and students regarding their perceptions of the needs they felt students had when they came to college as well as their ideas about how a special University High School could provide a

program that would be most helpful in meeting those needs. Such an event could accomplish several goals, it was suggested, including a direct collaborative experience and information enhancement process for the planners, and a broadening and consciousness-raising experience for members of the University community who had not been involved to date. A corollary purpose was to extend the collaboration and sense of connection beyond the College of Education and into the various academic areas that would add important dimensions to the nature of this endeavor. The idea was enthusiastically received and planning for this novel event was begun.

A final note on this historical background is an appropriate comment on the initial differences in vision, and purposes, which the Superintendent and Chancellor held at the outset of collaborative planning and public involvement. These differences centered around location and certain program priorities, and some of them stemmed from discrepant political pressures and concerns. The resolution of the details included a rather grand initiative, and it met criteria valued by both sides in this collaboration. Specifically, a second high school was identified in the process, a school that was very near the University (a key need expressed by the Chancellor) and one that was to be targeted as a "lab school" site for the University of Maryland. No other guidelines or strictures were specified in regard to this new piece (called the Northwestern - University of Maryland Collaborative Project after the name of the high school involved) and the County designated a new staff position as Coordinator for the project. While the University High School magnet, per se, was to be located at a school

quite some distance away, and included a number of design and expectation guidelines consistent with the overall magnet program, the parallel identification of the two sites satisfied all parties involved and provided for related and expanded collaboration of the University and the school system.

The purpose of recounting this background history is not only to provide context or details of this one process; it is also to suggest that this collaboration -- like almost every "real life" case of this type -- was neither perfect nor without its share of "bumps", conflicts of perception, misunderstandings, and mistakes of process. Nevertheless, as the motives and history were positive and basically mutually supportive, the foundation for fruitful collaborative development existed. Plenty of possibilities for "derailment" existed, but since the persons involved in the actual work of the project understood the complexities of collaboration and kept a focus on what *could* be done, the outcomes reflected a viable process overall. The ability of that process to include honest and critical feedback was based on a mutual history and trust.

The First Stage Data Collection Effort

As previously suggested, the data collection effort had larger implications than might be inherent in the information and opinions to be gathered. In the process of arranging and planning the event, the University representative was able to raise the consciousness about the planned high school, a key factor in relation to the campus as only a very few individuals had even heard of this potential collaboration; and the focus on a particular date, a special data gathering process, and the concept of further invitation to affiliate with a novel and promising educational development added luster and significance to the project.

The identification and contacting of appropriate University faculty and students was the first task on campus. Of logical importance was the need to identify instructors who had pertinent experience with freshmen and sophomores, and who had a thoughtful perspective on teaching and instructional concerns. The Dean and Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies, members of the office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and selected faculty with interest and knowledge in the areas of concern for this study were contacted. Their advice and support in the process were invaluable, and the result provided interviewers with appropriate University faculty in Arts and Humanities, English, Math, Geography, Chemistry, Sociology, Psychology, General Honors, and the Office of Minority Student Education. The faculty were almost all experienced, senior people and included a division provost, a program coordinator, and two administrators who worked primarily with undergraduate student support programs.

Soliciting appropriate students for this project was a bit more difficult in that identification and communication directed at only Prince George's high school graduates from the last two years was a cumbersome task. Nevertheless, efforts were successful (no attempt was made to get any kind of statistically representative sample) and undergraduates representing seven different Prince George's County High Schools were included as interviewees.

The data gathering process was organized around an interviewing strategy that could obtain information and expert opinion relevant to planners of the University High School curriculum. The teacher and teacher coordinator representatives from the school system's planning

subcommittees met with the University representative to devise questions for the interviews and to structure the process for asking the questions and clarifying responses. As the arrangements called for two or three faculty to be interviewed at a time, the intention of structuring the interviews was to be sure to ask the same questions to each small group. Similar procedures were devised for the student interviews, although the questions were different.

Questions asked of the faculty stemmed from the basic concerns of the planning committee members. They included questions about the greatest strengths and needs students appear to come with when they begin their careers at the University (academic and non-academic); about their sense of an ideal high school program in regard to preparing students for college today; what priorities they say in terms of the development of a University High School program; and what kinds of University participation they envisioned in an operating school such as this.

The responses of the faculty who were interviewed provided a tremendously interesting and useful collection of perspectives, information, and suggestions. Each member of the interviewing team recorded notes on the responses and submitted summaries, question by question, after the interviewing day ended. In addition, the responses were taped, and the school system supported the production of a transcript so that the data could be preserved in usable form. The examples that follow come from that transcript. They are only a few, but they represent the range and nature of much of the faculty response. Each example is paraphrased, or quoted as directly as possible, in order

to try to capture the type of interchange that was held. They should speak for themselves.

The top quality students are as good as they have ever been -- just top notch. But, the variance is greater. We're getting more students that have serious deficiencies and it would be important to reduce the variance, i.e. maintain the very good preparation the excellent students are getting but improve the preparation of the middle and lower middle students.

Students need a better sense of purpose -- motivation. The students that are having trouble don't know what they want to do with their lives, or why they're here.

Students are too career oriented, and the only thing they're looking for is an answer to the question "What is it for?" Knowledge and education don't always have an answer to that, but students are shutting out what they don't see as directly contributing to a career goal.

Don't do what has always been done (at least in the sciences) from kindergarten all the way through the university level, namely we tell kids that the reason for learning what we are studying this year is that you'll need it for what you'll be studying next year. Here, we tell them they must take X course because they need it for the following course. Naturally, we don't find the students to have genuine interest in what they are studying as they have no real reason for learning anything. What is missing partly is dealing with something for itself and not worrying about what it's going to do later. Work with the body of knowledge and master it and learn what it means to be playful with ideas and have a commitment to the knowledge and learn what it means to feel good about it and that it empowers one in certain ways intellectually. Learning is more than memorizing terms and learning a formula.

We need to emphasize creativity and satisfaction more, but the national tests that envelope us don't measure that; they measure what people wanted to measure in the 19th century and as long as that's the value system we're working with, we'll have a lot to overcome.

Experiment more with curriculum and teaching approaches. We are trying some things in terms of visual learning and active learning that may help match students' learning styles and capitalize on their strengths. These students can see more than we do and hear more than we do -- usually two or three different things, the television, the stereo and the telephone call as well as getting the visual input from the work. Instead of criticizing that, we should take advantage of it ...

The staff has to be very aware, both the staff at the University and the staff at the University High School, of the interdisciplinary nature of knowledge and the essential notion of a general education. Every math teacher should insist on English and every English teacher should insist on

science and math as students have to come to college with a core of knowledge and that knowledge is across the board — language, math, science, art (even).

University people would be very interested in being directly involved in the high school. But, the conditions have to be there — it has to fit in with the reward system, there has to be motivation. One strong motivation would be recruitment, we are working very hard on minority recruitment, and we can spend time and money in that area.

For the teachers, a smaller work load, offices for every teacher instead of a large space where 7 or 8 people are crammed together and so one can get any work done — these are needed changes. The great thing about being a college teacher is that you have some time that is your own during the day. A high school teacher doesn't. You get worn out, and the great compromise is that your preparation is quite as good as it should be but you just can't get by otherwise ...

Many other kinds of feedback were given, a good deal of it about individual disciplines, and that will be touched on later when the data from the *Curriculum Dialogues* are summarized. Certainly, opinions did not all form a consensus, and all opinions were not represented by the sample of faculty that was interviewed. However, the opportunity for the fresh, direct input and dialogue was unique and rich. The data had a kind of validity and credibility that could have an impact significantly different from the second-hand perspectives usually available.

Questions to the students who were recent graduates of Prince George's high schools included inquiries about what the most surprising aspects of college were when they arrived; what were their greatest needs; and what areas did they feel least prepared in, i.e. where did we "drop the ball". Some examples of the students' responses are as follows.

Students need exposure to the stress. In order to be successful in college you have got to be able to be stressed even though your teacher knows, she gives you ten problems when she knows you can only finish five, but it's the extra five that makes you work -- exposure to that type of pressure is what you need.

My biggest gripe I guess would be better study skills. You have to really teach yourself study skills once you start at the University. I felt in high school things were presented on a day to day basis of what you had to learn but there wasn't any real skill teaching as far as note taking, home preparation and how to better utilize outside resources which you really need in the University environment.

A discipline (self-discipline) to study and develop your own study habits and see what works for you and see what makes you successful in class is what prepares someone for college. That kind of discipline should come from a home that instills expectations and goals in a child. But, for students who don't have that type of home, the school should help the student learn to discipline yourself and to pace yourself and develop good habits ...

I think an important thing that ought to be put across to people in high school is the fact that in high school you will have teachers that will be on your back; it's like get this done, get this done, and they don't realize that when they come to college a professor will tell you two Thursdays hence we are going to have a test and that's all he says about the matter and if you don't remember it's your tough luck.

An internship, as they have available in college, is a good thing. If they could set up something similar in high school you might get some incentive or motivation there.

Well, I would pretty much fire the teachers that had problems and hire the new ones that I interviewed and saw that they were capable and interesting and give them a nice salary and then I would try to limit the size of the classes.

You have to have an administration that is flexible, you have to have good guidance counselors, the guidance counselor is a very important part of your life and he controls your college destiny. If he is not informed properly, if he doesn't have access to everything, if he just isn't interested in you, if he has 400 students to advise, how can he be interested in your position. You have to have more guidance counselors. That's crucial.

Last year we took a class called "ready workshop". It's an honors class here and it's a class that I really found useful because I learned for the first time how to write for myself and not for a teacher and I was wondering if you can carry something like that into the high school. We already had the basic writing skills, we were just trying to sharpen our different styles and it was very helpful as a personal thing to get to know what you are like through writing as an academic.

Overview of the Second Stage of Collaborative Field Research: The Curriculum Dialogues

The success and perceived usefulness of the first stage collaborative dialogues, and of the data derived from them, provided a model for further efforts as planning moved ahead toward the implementation phase.

First, a recapitulation of the purposes for the University High School Magnet Program emphasized the Superintendent and Chancellor's mutual commitment to the creation of a college preparatory high school program which would, once and for all, eliminate the traditional system of "blame" associated with freshmen college success and/or failure: typically, college and university personnel blame high school instructors for insufficiently equipping entering freshmen with academic survival skills; in turn, high school personnel blame middle school faculties. This chain typically continues on down to the elementary levels. They were determined to eradicate this chain by opening the formal lines of communication across institutional units, ensuring that both the University of Maryland and the school system came to a consensus about the kind of high school program to which a successful college freshman should have access.

Second, a framework for specific program planning was developed, and methods were designed to assist in this process. The results of the thinking here, and the outcomes of the planning, reflected commitment to continuing the collaborative involvement throughout the process.

The following broad goals for the process were identified and continue to serve as the foundation for both the University High School and Northwestern collaborative projects:

1. To elicit ongoing input from college and university representatives concerning the academic strengths and weaknesses of entering freshmen.
2. To identify instructional strategies and curriculum design features appropriate for use by public high schools to ensure that their graduates emerge with those academic skills/competencies identified by the College Board as necessary for success at the college or university level.
3. To address the special needs of minority students as part of the county and state's commitment to boosting minority college enrollment and improving minority retention rates at state colleges and universities.
4. To create formal institutional structures which will allow for mutually supportive collaborative efforts, including ongoing research projects, enrichment activities, and shared technical resources involving both the University of Maryland and the Prince George's County Public School System.
5. To improve cross-institutional communication and program articulation, including the creation of a formal network of support involving the school system, the University of Maryland, and other local colleges and universities, including Prince George's Community College and Bowie State University.

The findings from the first stage of dialogues, combined with the articulated program goals, became the organizing schema for the initial design of program components and parameters. After a Program Supervisor was selected, those organizing schema were utilized to create a second stage of collaborative field research, seven additional Curriculum Dialogues involving the University of Maryland and

representatives from a minimum of eight other colleges and universities in the Washington, D.C. area. (For a full treatment of the methodology and detailed findings of this process see: Brown, John L., "Summary Report: University High School Magnet Program Curriculum Dialogues", report to the Prince George's County Schools, April 30, 1987.)

The Dialogues concentrated on the following areas:

1. Communication Skills
2. English Language Arts
3. Behavioral and Social Sciences
4. The Humanities
5. Mathematics and Computer Sciences
6. Natural Sciences
7. Guidance and Counseling
8. Direct Instruction of Thinking Skills

Participants were identified, in each of the areas noted, from a number of Washington, D.C. colleges and universities. At those institutions which had named coordinators or liaisons to work with the school system on this project, the Program Supervisor of the University High School utilized those contacts to find appropriate faculty experts to invite. In the other institutions, department chairs were contacted to help in the selection and invitation process. With the help of an Early Intervention Grant (created to assist in the recruitment/retention efforts related to minority students in IHE's) from the State Board for Higher Education, participants were convened in seven different dialogues held during March and April of 1987. The Program Supervisor then proceeded to do the synthesis and summary report based on these unique collaborative events.

These dialogues provided invaluable data concerning participants' views on the nature of a successful college preparatory experience. Although wide-ranging and frequently lively in the diversity of points-of-view expressed, what is perhaps most striking is the consistency of suggestions made in each, and the replication of many perspectives that were enunciated in the first stage interview process. These general suggestions for improving the academic performance of entering college freshmen and for increasing retention rates included the following:

1. High school instruction should center much more on an active inquiry approach and much less on didactic, teacher-centered approaches. Far less emphasis should be placed on rote memorization and thoughtless regurgitation.
2. All high schools should mount a major campaign to improve student mastery of those academic competencies identified by the College Board as necessary for success at the college or university level: analytical and critical reading; writing across the disciplines; speaking and listening; math problem solving; advanced study skills; computer literacy; and critical thinking, problem solving, and decision making.
3. Students must be given opportunities for experiential learning options. Schools must continually strive to make learning relevant to students. We must create a context of meaning for students and move beyond the factory, lock-step model that still dominates much of public education.
4. Process should play as major role as content in an effective instructional delivery system. Given the information explosion which our society is experiencing, students must be taught the processes of critical thinking, creative problem solving, decision making, and fundamental research so that they can become access information when they need it and, ultimately, become lifetime

learners responsible for their own education. Learning must be viewed as a continual priority, not something that stops with a diploma.

5. Parents and the community at large must play a far more active role in the educational arena. We must make far greater use of mentors in business and other settings to augment our instructional and guidance efforts, particularly our commitment to making students understand the meaning and worth of what they are being asked to learn.
6. Far more opportunities must become available to students to familiarize themselves with the demands and opportunities of a college or university setting before attending one. Such options as shadowing experiences, collaborative projects involving high schools and local post-secondary institutions, and other strategies must be used far more extensively.
7. Peer counseling, introduction to role models, upgraded tutorial experiences, and exposure to a developmental college preparatory guidance program are critical for improving the performance of all high school students, but are particularly critical for addressing the needs of minority students planning to attend college. The model employed by the University of California at Berkeley to improve student retention and performance in mathematics and science is one that deserves careful scrutiny for potential replication in all college-preparatory high school programs.

The Northwestern Collaborative Project

While this paper has concentrated on the case of the University High School magnet program, and the nature of collaboration involved with it, a note on a parallel venture should be made. As was mentioned previously, the Northwestern Collaborative Project was created as a companion effort to the University High School. Specifically, the Northwestern/University of Maryland Collaborative Project began with a two-day dialogue conducted on the University campus involving faculty

representatives from both institutions, system administrators and supervisors, parent representatives, and students. At the conclusion of this two-day experience, a model for the collaborative project had been formulated, with clearly identified priorities involving curriculum and instructional modifications, special projects and enrichment activities, and college and career preparation resources that could be sponsored for Northwestern students by both the school and the University. Following this kickoff process, University personnel were critical in helping the school to design a three-part governance structure which would help ensure the project's success as an ongoing collaborative effort. This structure included the formulation of three major, interrelated entities involving both high school and university representatives, including a Steering Committee, a Planning Committee, and a minimum of three special subcommittees designed to oversee the implementation of the three identified program priority areas. While the political context and framework for this collaborative project differ significantly from the University High School, both are intended to serve as models that will generate replicable innovations, and both are models of serious, continuing school - college collaboration.

Summary of Implementation Activities

Like the Northwestern project, the University High School program was augmented with a Steering Committee comprised of administrative and instructional representatives from local colleges and universities. This committee ensures ongoing, productive collaboration occurs. Since the formal implementation of the magnet's first year during the 1987-88 academic year, such collaboration has included the following activities and projects:

1. Formal Research Projects: including ongoing examination of whatSizer calls "authentic assessment measures" to complement and ultimately replace existing emphasis upon convergent response instruments. Additional research projects have involved such areas as the role of computer-assisted instruction in the enhancement of student performance in Algebra and Geometry classes.
2. College Visitations: University High School students have received a variety of opportunities to visit the University of Maryland campus, interact with faculty and student representatives, and even visit classes in session.
3. Parent Outreach: University of Maryland staff have been actively involved in University High School programs designed to assist parents and students in the college selection and application process, as well as providing opportunities for campus visitations and discussions of financial aid.
4. Guest Lectures and Presentations: Again, university personnel have been actively involved in all aspects of magnet instruction, including large lectures, co-leading seminars, and critiquing curriculum design.
5. University Resource Access: Both staff members and students have been allowed to access

University of Maryland facilities and resources as part of this collaborative effort, including specially-designed tours of the Hornbake Undergraduate Library for high school teachers planning to work with their students on extended research projects.

6. Participation in University Classes and Symposia: Students from both Northwestern and Suitland High Schools have been given access to a variety of special academic experiences normally not available to them, including ongoing participation in a series of special Honors Colloquia.
7. Specially Designed Enrichment Activities: including a program designed by the University of Maryland Honors Office called "Washington as a Cultural Resource," a series of Saturday classes conducted by Maryland professors for students and their parents to explore the Nation's Capital as a treasure house of cultural resources, from the visual and performing arts to literature and architecture.

Both institutions have benefited in a variety of ways from this partnership. Perhaps most importantly, however, are the benefits derived by the individuals, particularly minority students, participating in both the University High School and the Northwestern/University of Maryland Collaborative Project. The success of the collaboration between the University of Maryland and Prince George's County Public Schools rests on the commitment of the professionals involved, the clarity of program design, and ongoing attention to the presence of operating principles that stress continued teamwork, dedication of staff, high level institutional commitment, and systematic monitoring to insure that planning and program changes will be dynamic and responsive to needs.

Observations and Learnings About Collaboration of This Type

From the experience of this process, and its consequences, some generalizations can be made. While it cannot be claimed that these generalizations will hold up outside of the context for the collaboration described here, relevance to other collaborations is likely.

1. Collaboration, especially in an area which involves people new to such a process, is as much a matter of consciousness raising as anything. A major accomplishment can be the destruction of stereotypes, held by members of each institution about the other, which can then lead to meaningful professional interaction. It's a formal method for seeing to it that articulation and interchange occur, and it removes the isolation which prevents significant potential from ever being realized.

2. The progression from "primitive" to more polished collaborative planning strategies can work well. It is not necessary to have all aspects defined and planned in advance. Similarly, finding the balance of feasible contributions of the collaborative agents is an important practical step toward achieving a useful result.

3. Once this type of collaborative initiative is begun, a positive (often unanticipated) outcome may be the recognition of how receptive people really are to such a process -- if only they are given a chance.

4. It is important to articulate governance, structure, and priorities early in order to institutionalize collaboration gains and help insure survival despite personnel shifts.

5. Small may be better. Concentrate on the projects that tap into the predetermined goals of both institutions, and utilize those persons who are willing to work -- even on a small scale.

6. The reward structure, especially in IHE's, needs reexamination (again) if collaborative efforts with the schools are to receive enduring faculty support and effort.

7. Personnel involved in organizing, coordinating, and furthering collaborative projects must be divergent, flexible thinkers and doers.

8. Collaboration isn't easy, it won't be perfect -- either in process or in result -- but it can be a valuable force for improvement and enhancement for all parties and institutions concerned.